

# -- Interim Report --

## **Changes in soil properties as a result of compost or mulch application: Results of On-farm Sampling**

**Prepared by Sally Brown and Matt Cotton**

# -- Interim Report --

## Contents

Executive Summary .....	ES-1
Introduction.....	9
Materials and methods .....	10
Sampling sites	
Experimental methods	
Results.....	19
Summary across all sites .....	19
Nutrient availability	
Carbon-related variables	
Soil water	
Affect of application rate .....	23
Carbon-related variables	
Soil water	
Highlights of specific sites.....	29
Orchard crops	
Row crops	
Mulch application	
Comparison with Organics Life Cycle Assessment .....	34
Water use	
Fertilizer value	
Herbicide/pesticide use	
Total organic carbon	
Remediation of saline/sodic soils	
Erosion	
Soil structure	
Plant response	
Soil tilth	
Conclusions and recommendations.....	41
References.....	44

# -- Interim Report --

## Tables & Figures

Table 1	Nutrient content of the composts used in this sampling.....	11
Table 2	Sample sites for soil collection .....	15
Table 3	Available nutrient concentrations for compost and control soils.....	20
Table 4	Response to compost or mulch application at three specific sites .....	39
Table 5	Comparison of CA sampling results with ROU study .....	37
Table 6	Total Greenhouse gas credits for use of compost in the CA sampling ..... and ROU study	42
Figure 1	Soil nitrogen in compost and control soils.....	21
Figure 2	Summary table .....	23
Figure 3	Total organic carbon .....	24
Figure 4	Soil bulk density .....	25
Figure 5	Soil respiration (CO <sub>2</sub> evolved).....	26
Figure 6	Water holding capacity .....	27
Figure 7	Water infiltration.....	29

# -- Interim Report --

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As part of a Life Cycle Assessment of Organic Materials Diversion Alternatives, research was conducted to quantify the benefits from applying compost to agricultural soils in California. An earlier study, prepared by the Recycled Organics Unit (ROU) of the University of New South Wales, was used as a blue print for this work. In that study, a survey of the literature was conducted to estimate potential benefits related to compost use. For this study, field sampling from farms sites with a history of compost or mulch use were identified. Soil cores and other soil samples were taken and submitted to a lab for analysis. The parameters that we measured included a subset of those used by the ROU that were possible to analyze based on our limited time and budget. The analysis that was done was compared to the results in the ROU study to see if the quantification of the benefits associated with land application of organics as defined in that study were applicable to soils in California.

The project sought to investigate the impact of adding compost produced using feedstocks generated by municipalities (yard waste and food scraps) to agricultural soils from a greenhouse gas and life cycle perspective (i.e., are there greenhouse-gas-reducing benefits or other benefits that have value in a life cycle assessment) that accrue by adding compost to agricultural soils. The following areas were investigated:

- Total organic carbon
- Microbial activity
- Water holding capacity
- Water infiltration rate
- Bulk density
- Nutrient availability.

Some of the results are summarized in Figure ES-1

# -- Interim Report --




Figure ES-1. The % change of soil organic carbon, microbial activity, water holding capacity and bulk density in compost amended soils in comparison to control soils (control soils taken from work row or other crop area with the same soil series). A value > 100% signifies a positive change, a value < 100% signifies a negative change.

The results of the field analysis were then compared with data presented in a recent Life Cycle Analysis of Window Composting (See Table ES1) (ROU 2006). This study was much broader than our field sampling in that it used all available literature to quantify benefits associated with compost use in Australia. This sampling was conducted to determine whether these benefits were suitable for use in California. In general, the current sampling found comparable but slightly larger benefits associated with compost use. The results of the comparison as well as benefits recommended by the ROU study that were outside of our sampling are shown below.

# -- Interim Report --

**Table ES1 A comparison of sampling results from this study with ROU Life Cycle data. The ROU study (2006) quantified potential benefits of compost use for row crops and orchard crops for soils in New South Wales using an extensive literature review of benefits associated with use of compost to develop values. The results of our sampling are compared to the results of the ROU study and default recommendations are suggested**

	ROU	CA tilled	CA- surface	CA- mulch	Recommended Default
	per dry metric ton compost (unless otherwise specified)				
Fertilizer (NPK kg CO <sub>2eq</sub> )	11.8-31.3*		56	0	56- based on NP(as P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> )K of 9, 9.5 and 10 kg per Mg Use specific compost analysis when possible
Organic carbon	256 kg CO <sub>2</sub>	291 kg CO <sub>2</sub>	382 kg CO <sub>2</sub>	0	256 kg CO <sub>2</sub> for tilled sites, 300-325 Mg for no till or orchard sites
Water efficiency (% increase)	0.125	1.1	0.5	0.44	0.125
Soil structure-bulk density (% decrease)	2% decrease per 12 Mg compost for incorporated	2.9% decrease per 12 Mg	0.7% decrease per 12 Mg	0.7% decrease per 12 Mg	2% per 12 Mg incorporated, 0.5% per 12 Mg for surface application
Erosion (as indicated by water infiltration rates)	1.2% reduction in tilled crops, complete reduction for mulch applications	Infiltration rate 4% as long as control	Infiltration rate 24% longer than control-results specific to site on a sandy soil	Infiltration rate 4% as long as control	We saw an overall average increase in water infiltration rate of 33% across all sites that received compost or mulch. This can be used as an indicator of reduced erosion potential. Use ROU default values

# -- Interim Report --

Herbicide kg CO <sub>2eq</sub>	30 kg CO <sub>2eq</sub> per kg herbicide				60 kg per ha in orchard crops based on 2 herbicide sprays per season
Saline/sodic	Gypsum replacement				California specific studies recommended
Plant yield	1-2% yield increase per Mg compost				1-2% yield increase per Mg compost
Soil Tilth- using carbon and microbial activity (as CO <sub>2</sub> evolved through microbial respiration) as indicators	Degradation of soils has a cost of \$4484 per ha	146% increase in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/ increase in carbon from 0.7 to 1.1%	Overall 33% increase in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/ overall increase in carbon from 0.7% to 1.27%	164% increase in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/ no increase in soil carbon	ROU notes soil with organic C > 2% is healthy. Use of compost over time has the potential to improve soil tilth and result in quantifiable \$ savings per ha

\* The ROU study was done using standard units. The standard unit for land is a hectare. One hectare measures 100 x 100 m<sup>2</sup> and is equivalent to 2.47 acres. The standard unit for mass is one metric ton that is equivalent to 1000 kg or 1,000,000 g (Mg). Compost applied at 1 US ton per acre is the same as compost applied at 2.24 metric tons per ha.

# -- Interim Report --

From a GHG perspective, there is an estimated savings of 316 kg of CO<sub>2</sub> per metric ton of compost use as low fertility mulch and 277 kg of CO<sub>2</sub> per metric ton of compost tilled into soils for use as a soil conditioner according to the ROU estimates (Table ES2). This is based on soil carbon sequestration, avoided use of synthetic fertilizers and herbicides and pesticides. Based on the results from our survey, this figure increases to approximately 508 kg of CO<sub>2</sub> per metric ton of compost applied as a surface mulch in organic orchards. There was a savings of 357 kg of CO<sub>2</sub> per metric ton of compost used as a soil conditioner based on data from the tilled site that we sampled. In addition to the benefits re GHG emissions, benefits were observed for water infiltration in finer soils and water holding capacity (particularly in coarser textured soils). The benefits regarding water were higher but similar to the ROU study. A conservative estimate of a 0.125% increase in water efficiency per metric ton of compost is recommended.

**Table ES2. Greenhouse gas savings associated with the use of compost for surface application (mulch) and tilled into soils (till). Results presented include savings calculated in the Recycled Organics LCA and from samples collected at an organic orchard and tilled row crop site in CA.**

	<b>Mulch</b>		<b>Till</b>	
	ROU	CA	ROU	CA
	kg CO <sub>2</sub> per dry Mg Compost			
Fertilizer		66	21	66
Herbicide	60	60		
Soil Carbon	256	382	256	291
<b>Total GHG benefits</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>357</b>



# -- Interim Report --

## 1 Introduction

2  
3 Organic materials (leaves, grass, food scraps, etc.) comprise a significant category of recyclable  
4 wastes still being disposed in California landfills. A statewide waste characterization study  
5 (CIWMB 2004) identified that seven of the top ten materials disposed in California landfills  
6 were organic. Diverting organic materials from landfills is a key aspect of achieving California's  
7 50 percent recycling goal. With the passage of AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act,  
8 diverting organics also has the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and provide  
9 compost for use as a soil amendment. In the emerging effort to reduce greenhouse gasses,  
10 landfill diversion of organics has primarily been understood as a means to reduce methane  
11 emissions into the atmosphere (USEPA 2006, 2007a, 2007b, Pipatti et al., 2006, Clean  
12 Development Mechanism, 2008; Chicago Climate Exchange, 2009). The Clean Development  
13 Mechanism has established a protocol that gives carbon credits for landfill diversion of organics  
14 to compost facilities (Clean Development Mechanism, 2008). Carbon credits are based on the  
15 methane gas that would have been released after the organics are placed into the landfill and  
16 prior to the initiation of gas collection. The benefits are based on a per ton basis of feedstocks  
17 diverted from landfills. No credits are provided for use of composts. For materials that are  
18 composted, the composting process results in significant volume reduction of 40-80% due to  
19 decomposition (i.e. a single ton of organics that qualifies for methane avoidance credits through  
20 diversion to a compost facility yields as little as 200 kg per compost). Greenhouse gas benefits  
21 associated with use of compost would potentially be for soil carbon sequestration and herbicide  
22 or fertilizer avoidance. In comparison with methane avoidance that has a CO<sub>2</sub> equivalence of 21  
23 times, each of those benefits would be based on CO<sub>2</sub> and so are likely to be significantly lower  
24 than benefits associated with methane avoidance.

25  
26 Despite this fact, there is a growing recognition of the benefits associated with use of organic  
27 amendments in soils. These are based both on smaller, yet significant, GHG benefits as well as  
28 the increased soil health in cases where organic amendments are regularly applied. A large  
29 number of studies have shown increased soil carbon concentrations when manures, composts or  
30 municipal biosolids are land applied (Albaladejo et al., 2008; Favoino and Hogg, 2008; Kong et  
31 al., 2005; Schroder et al., 2008; Smith et al., 2007). Increasing soil carbon is a cost effective  
32 means to sequester carbon that provides a range of ancillary benefits. These potential benefits  
33 include increased water holding capacity, increased water infiltration rates, reduced bulk density,  
34 improved soil tilth (health and workability of soil), reduced erosion potential, decreased need for  
35 herbicides and pesticides, decreased salinization, reduced fertilizer requirements, and improved  
36 yields and/or crop quality (eg. Cogger et al., 2008; Favoino and Hogg, 2008; Recycled Organics  
37 Unit, 2006). Each of these can have an enormous financial impact on high value agriculture. In  
38 combination, these benefits can result in increased profitability and competitiveness for  
39 agriculture.

40  
41 Recognition of the potential benefits associated with compost use is growing at the same time  
42 that the importance of the sustainability of our soil resources is increasingly being recognized  
43 (eg.: Lal, 2007; Mann, 2008). As the value of soil is understood, the negative impacts of  
44 intensive agriculture and urbanization on soil are also being recognized (Lal, 2007). Organic  
45 amendments, such as composts are a means to restore the health and productivity of soils (Smith  
46 et al., 2007, Favoino and Hogg, 2008; Recycled Organics Unit, 2006). The Recycled Organics

# -- Interim Report --

Unit of the University of New South Wales (ROU) (2006) quantified benefits of organics use by conducting a thorough literature review of reported benefits over a broad range of soil and plant characteristics. These were then used to estimate potential benefits for compost use in New South Wales for two types of use: as a low fertility surface applied mulch use and a tilled into soil as a soil conditioner. Both cases were modeled on high value crops. The study did not consider use of compost for agronomic crops. High value agriculture is a major industry in California. It is also the primary user of potable water in California. Water and soil quality have been degraded through conventional agricultural practices. These factors suggest that quantification of the benefits of compost use in California is important. Although the most significant greenhouse gas reductions associated with landfill diversion of organics may be related to methane avoidance, the benefits associated with compost use are likely to be appreciated from a broader perspective.


A soil survey/sampling was conducted to quantify the benefits associated with compost use in California. The variables tested in the sampling included total soil organic carbon and nitrogen, available nutrients, bulk density, soil microbial activity, water holding capacity, water infiltration rate and soil texture. These variables were selected as they reflected benefits observed from compost use in other studies and were feasible to measure in the time frame and budget allotted for this work. The study done by the ROU (2006) was used as a basis of comparison for our results. If the results of our limited survey generally agree with the results based on the extensive literature search done by the ROU (2006), there is the potential to directly apply those findings to California agriculture and other areas of potential compost use. The survey sites were determined by working with the farming contacts of large-scale composting operations in a number of counties. These sites are representative of operating farms, rather than replicated experimental field plots that are customarily used for research. Using actual working field sites can lack the precision offered in replicated trials. Higher variability is also anticipated when working with actual farms in comparison to replicated field trials. However, working directly with farmers presents an opportunity to get a 'real world' view of current compost use and its' associated benefits in California across a wide range of sites, soils, and crops.

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Site selection**

Sites to be sampled were selected by working with compost producers in different counties (Riverside, Ventura, Kern, Stanislaus, and Monterey). Sites used in this study are listed in Table 2. Sites were selected to be representative of agricultural regions and types of crops that use compost generated by residuals produced in the regions identified by the CIWMB for the LCA. A map of the study sites in relation to the regions identified for study in the LCA is shown below.

# -- Interim Report --



In most cases, sites were selected through discussions with compost producers and their growers. In a few cases, the compost facilities were located on the farms. Generally the farmer or a representative of the farmer met us at the site. In other cases, the compost producers were familiar with the farm and were able to provide information on the history of compost use and the rate applied. For almost all cases, precise application histories were not available. Compost was applied on a wet weight basis and percent solids for each material applied wasn't known. We assumed a solids content of 50% based on discussion with the compost producers. In most cases, compost was applied as a band under the trees. Here the width covered by the spreader was not known and again, an application rate was estimated based on the width of the work row in comparison to the orchard crop. The work row is the area in between the crop row that is used to gain access to the crop by workers as well as any equipment such as a compost spreaders. The crop row for all sites covered about 50% of the total land area. Generally, it was assumed that compost was applied to about 50% of the soil surface. Based on these assumptions, an application of 10 wet tons per acre, was taken to be 5 dry tons per acre. Applied to 50% of the soil surface gives a total application to the treated area of 10 dry t/a. Reported rates throughout the remainder of the report represent dry loading rates. Total rates presented here should be considered more as general approximations rather than precise loading figures. Nutrient content of the composts used by farmers in this study was similar. Concentrations of N, P, and K for all composts used on the farms that we sampled is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Total nitrogen, phosphorus (as  $P_2O_5$ ) and potassium of composts used by growers included in the sampling trip.**

	N	$P_2O_5$	K
		lbs per dry ton	
Cal Biomass	18	19	20
Agromin	28	12.6	20

# -- Interim Report --

Grover	32	54	14.4
Z-Best	22	8.2	14.6

A list of the properties visited with short descriptions of each site follows.

## *Site descriptions*

### ***Riverside County***

Two farms were sampled in Riverside County; Rucker and HMS. Both have a history of use of compost produced by California Biomass. California Biomass produces compost using different green wastes as well as food processing wastes.

Bruce Rucker is an organic grower who uses compost as his sole source of fertilizer for a range of crops including different types of citrus and grapes. We sampled both soils from under lemon trees and grapes taking control samples from the work row. Each of the orchards that we sampled had a similar history of compost use. Compost was applied at a rate of 20 wet tons/acre per year for 10 years as a split application (2 x 10 tons per year). The compost was banded so that it was applied only to the areas under the trees or vines. Assuming a moisture content of 50%, this type of application is equivalent to 20 dry tons per acre per year or total loading over the 10 year period of 200 dry tons per acre. The primary reason for using compost at this farm is to supply the fertilizer needs of his crop. He is also concerned with high salt irrigation water. Compost relieves salt stress and also improves soil quality. Gypsum is added with the compost to improve the Sodium Adsorption ratio (SAR).

HMS Agricultural owned the second farm that was sampled. The sampled area was planted in mature organic mango trees. Compost had been applied for a minimum of 5 years with a single application of 15-20 wet tons per year as a surface application under the trees. This is equivalent to an annual application of approximately 15-20 dry tons per acre for the areas that received compost. A mixture of compost from California Biomass and composted chicken manure was used to provide sufficient fertility to the site. The primary reason for compost use at this site is to provide fertilizers to the trees. Secondary reasons for using compost include reduced water stress on trees, increased water holding capacity in soils and increased soil health. Control samples for this site were collected from the work row. Eight acre- feet of water are used each year to irrigate the mangos.

### ***Ventura County***

Two sites that had received mulch applications were sampled in Ventura County. The mulch consisted of coarsely (>5 cm) ground green waste from Material Recovery Facilities in Los Angeles. Organic Ag Inc served as an intermediary between the MRFs and the growers. The mulch was processed (i.e., chipped) but not composted. The first site that was sampled had received a single 8" surface application of mulch under mango trees. The primary reason for mulch application was erosion control. The control samples for this site were taken from the work row. A second mulch site was also sampled. Here, a single application, of a similar depth was made to a Mineola orchard. Control samples were taken from a nearby field which was planted in mature avocado trees. The soil series in the control field was different than the soils in the Mineola orchard.

# -- Interim Report --

Soil samples were also collected from the Limoneira Company. Agromin operates a compost facility adjacent to the Limoneira Company orchard sites and provided compost for the site. At Limoneira, compost had been added to lemon trees at 30 wet t/a for 3-4 years. Application was banded directly under the trees. The primary reason for compost application was to improve quality of the fruit. Control samples were collected directly under the trees of a different lemon orchard where synthetic fertilizers had been used on the same farm and were from the same soil series.

## ***Kern County***

Soil samples were collected from a conventionally managed grape orchard called the Grapery. Originally when it wasn't possible to purchase large quantities of compost, compost for this site was produced by the farmer. Currently Mr. Pandol purchases compost from Community Recycling and Resource Recovery in Arvin. Community Recycling composts green material from the Central Valley and Los Angeles areas as well as food scraps collected from grocery stores. The Grapery currently applies about 3 tons per acre banded on the grapes. Compost has been applied annually to the soil since 1991 with the exception of two years of missed applications. He uses compost for fruit quality, to maintain healthy vines, and to reduce water and fertilizer use. Control samples from this site were collected from the work rows.

## ***Kings County***

Kochergan Farms is another location where the compost facility is surrounded by orchards. Green material is collected from the surrounding Fresno County area (the facility is just over the Kings County border with Fresno County). Soil samples were collected from an almond orchard that was in the process of becoming certified organic. Compost had been applied to the soils under the trees in two previous applications of 20 wet t/a and a single application of 6 wet t/a over a 3 year period. Compost is applied to meet the fertilizer needs of the trees. Control soils were collected from the work rows.

## ***Stanislaus County***

In Stanislaus County representatives from the Grover Environmental compost facility provided access to growers who used their compost. Grover makes compost from green material and food residuals primarily from the San Francisco Bay Area. Soil samples were collected from under the trees in an organic apricot orchard. Compost had been applied under the trees to supply the nutrients for the fruit at a rate of 4 t/a for a minimum of 5 years. Control samples were collected from another apricot orchard that was managed conventionally. The soil series for the two orchards were different.

## ***Monterey County***

In Monterey County three fields were sampled all of which were owned by Tanimura & Antle (T&A). T&A buys compost from the Z-Best Composting Facility in Santa Clara County. Most of Z-Best's compost is made from green material that comes primarily from collection programs in the City of San Jose. Soils were sampled from high production, tilled row crop soils. Three sites were sampled here. Two of the fields had a single owner who leased the land. Compost use was a requirement of the lease. One of these fields was certified organic and compost had been applied at 5 dry t/a for 9+ years. The other was managed conventionally and had had compost

# -- Interim Report --

- 1 applied at 2.5 dry t/a for 10+ years. The control soils for this series were sampled from a field
- 2 across the road that was also used for row crop production, was managed conventionally, and
- 3 was the same soil series.

# -- Interim Report --

**Table 2. Sample sites for soil collection.**

Compost/mulch application rate and total application rates are approximate values based on the best recollection of the compost supplier and or the farmer.

<b>Farm</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Crop</b>	<b>Organic</b>	<b>Soil series</b>	<b>Compost/mulch application rate</b>	<b>Years of application</b>	<b>Total application (dry t/a)</b>
Bruce Rucker	Riverside	Perennial	yes	Myoma fine sand	20 t/a	10+	200
HMS	Riverside	Perennial	yes	Cochella fine sand	15-20 t/a	5+	75+
Organic Ag.	Ventura	Perennial	no	Azule gravelly loam	122	1	122
Organic Ag.	Ventura	Perennial	no	Mocho loam	120	1	120
			control	Metz loamy fine sand			
Limoneira	Ventura	Perennial	no	Mocho clay loam	30 t/a	3-4	100
			control	Mocho loam			
The Grapery	Kern	Perennial	no	McFarland silty loam	3 t/a	15	45
Kochergan	Kings	Perennial	yes	Lethent clay loam	23 t/a	2	46
			control				
Grover	Stanislaus	Perennial	yes	Zacharias clay loam	4 t/a	5+	20

# -- Interim Report --

			control	Vernalis clay loam			
Peter	Stanislaus	row crop	no	Hillmar loamy sand	-		
				Dinuba sandy loam			
T&A	Monterey	row crop	yes	Pico fine sandy loam	5 t/a	9	45
		row crop	no		2.5 t/a	10+	25

---



# -- Interim Report --



**Soil sample collection (a) water infiltration ring, (b) bulk density core and intact core used for water holding capacity and microbial activity, and (c) collecting cores for soil chemical analysis including total C and N and available nutrients**

# -- Interim Report --

## ***Soil sample collection***

Soil samples were collected as follows. For total carbon, nitrogen and available nutrient (Cu, Fe, Mn, Mg, P, and Zn) analysis, 2.5 cm soil cores were collected at the 0-15 cm depth. Soils were also collected from the 15-30 cm depth and were analyzed for total carbon and nitrogen. A minimum of 4 cores, collected from random locations, were composited for each sample. Cores were also collected from the 15-30 cm depth for total C and N analysis. Bulk density samples were collected using a hammer-driven core sampler that collected a 3 cm deep x 5.4 cm core (Grossman and Reinsch, 2002). One bulk density core was collected from each location. Water infiltration was measured using a single ring falling-head procedure (Soil Quality Institute, 1999). Infiltration rates were measured 2 times per site. The second measure was used for all sites for analysis as by this second measure, both irrigated and control soils had reached similar saturation levels. Water holding capacity and soil microbial function were measured on intact cores collected using a 15 cm long x 5 cm diameter pipe section that was hammer driven into the soil.

For compost- amended areas, soil samples as described above, were collected from three separate locations within the compost amended area. These were directly under the crops for orchard sites and randomly within the treated areas for row crops. Control samples were collected either from the work row of the compost amended sites or from nearby orchards (Deurer et al., 2008). A minimum of two soil samples were collected from each of the control areas.

## ***Soil analysis***

All soil analysis was conducted at Soil Control Labs in Watsonville, CA. Total carbon and nitrogen were measured by combustion. Inorganic and organic carbon was accounted for by a two-stage combustion. Intact samples were analyzed for total carbon. Acid was then added to the soil to volatilize any carbon associated with carbonates. The remaining soil was re-analyzed for total carbon. The % carbon in the second combustion was taken as the organic carbon content of the soil. Available nutrients were analyzed using the Mehlich III extract (Mehlich, 1984). Soil water holding capacity was measured at 1 barr soil moisture tension on intact cores. Soil microbial activity as CO<sub>2</sub> evolution was measured as follows: a soil core maintained at 1 barr moisture tension was incubated at 27° C for 48 hr. The soil core was then placed in a 1liter jar and incubated for 24 hour. CO<sub>2</sub> evolved after 24 hr was measured using an IR detector

## ***Data analysis***

Data was analyzed using SPSS version 16 (SPSS, 2005). Statistics for all main effects were compared using analysis of variance (Anova) with  $p < 0.05$ . Compost and mulch amended sites were analyzed separately except for water infiltration rates. Means were separated using the Duncan Waller procedure following a significant ANOVA. Variables measured included soil organic carbon, bulk density, microbial activity, water holding capacity, total nitrogen, water infiltration rate, and MIII extractable nutrients. The significance of each of these variables as a function of treatment, site and treatment x site were examined. Site, treatment and treatment x site were generally significant at  $p < 0.05$ . In order to be able to assess the effect of treatment across all sites, the data was transformed to create a more normal distribution. A ratio variable was created that measured the response of each parameter at a site in the treated soils to the average value of that parameter in the control samples for that site (Brown et al., 2004). Use of

# -- Interim Report --

the ratio variables enabled comparison of response to compost addition across a wide range of soil series. Ratio variables were used for organic carbon, bulk density, soil microbial activity, and water holding capacity.

## Results

### Summary Results—Across All Sites

#### *Nutrient availability*

In addition to adding carbon to soils, compost contains a range of macro and micro- nutrients. When used to meet the nitrogen needs of a crop, compost will also potentially satisfy at least a portion of plant requirements for phosphorus, zinc, iron, copper, manganese and potassium. For nutrient availability, compost would be expected to increase nutrient content in comparison to samples taken from the work row. For samples where the control was collected from other orchards or managed soils, nutrients in the compost- amended soils would be expected to be similar to the control sites. In cases where control samples were collected from other orchards or managed fields, available Fe, Mg, Mn, P, and Zn concentrations were statistically similar in compost amended and control sites (Table 3). There was a tendency for increased availability of Mn, P and Zn in the compost amended soils in comparison to the control but this was not statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). There was also a tendency for higher available Fe in the control soils, but again, this was not significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Available K and Cu were increased in the compost-amended soils in comparison to the control. For cases where the control sample was collected from the work row, compost amendment increased available nutrient concentration for Fe, Mg, Mn, P and Zn in comparison to the control soils. The mean value of extractable K and Cu were also higher in the compost amended soils, however, samples showed high variability and so these increases were not significant. For copper, there was a very high available copper sample from one of the compost amended sites that resulted in the high standard error. There was no difference in nutrient availability following mulch application in comparison to control samples collected from the work row or another orchard site.

# -- Interim Report --


**Table 3. Mehlich III available nutrient concentrations (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) for compost and control soils. Means ± standard error are shown. Values in bold are significantly different (p<0.05). For work row/same soil series, n=40, for other orchard/soil series n=10.**

	Iron		Potassium		Magnesium		Copper		Manganese		Phosphorus		Zinc	
	mg kg													
	Control from other orchard/soil series													
Compost	243	±38.9	583	±199	1560	±428	46.5	±7.29	276	±135	104	±64	33.9	±23.3
Control	332	±101	276	±104	1500	±508	25.3	±4.5	206	±91	52	±14	9.2	±1.4
	Control from work row/same soil series													
Compost	423	±124	636	±477	984	±393	18	±24	163	±36	409	±222	46	±41
Control	334	±146	596	±520	736	±305	7.1	±9.8	120	±53	186	±100	13	±9.7

# -- Interim Report --

## **Soil nitrogen**

Across all compost amended sites where the control was taken from the work row, compost application increased total nitrogen in the 0-15 cm horizon of the soil. Total N increased from  $0.1 \pm 0.02\%$  in the work row soils to  $0.21 \pm 0.03\%$  in the compost amended soils (Figure 1). There was no difference in total N in the compost amended soils ( $0.095\%$ ) in comparison to the control soils ( $0.094\%$ ) when the control sample was taken from another farm with a different soil series. There were also no significant differences in total soil N for the compost-amended soils in comparison to either control at the 15-30 cm depth.



**Figure 1. Soil nitrogen (%) in all compost amended soils and control soils sampled in the survey where soil series between control and compost amended was the same (n=40). Means and standard error are shown. Bars are also shown for organic managed fields where compost was the only source of nitrogen for the soil (n=21).**

Some of the sites that we sampled were managed conventionally while others were certified organic. The above comparison does not take into account the N input from conventional fertilizers that may have contributed to the observed increase in soil N in the compost-amended soils. To compensate for this, the analysis was also run to compare total soil N in the compost-amended soils of organic farms in comparison to the control. Here also, the increase in soil nitrogen was significant and slightly more pronounced in the compost amended compared to the control soils in comparison to the data set as a whole.

# -- Interim Report --

## ***Soil Carbon***

Across all cases where the control samples were collected from the same soil series as the compost amended soils, the ratio variable showed significantly increased soil organic carbon ( $p < 0.0001$ )(Figure 2). Mean organic carbon in the compost amended soils measured 3 x that in the control soils. This difference was in the surface 0-15 cm soil horizon. There was no significant difference in organic soil carbon in the 15-30 cm soil depth. . Across all sites, the average % C in the 0-15 cm depth was  $1.5 \pm 1.2$ . In the 15-30 cm depth the average % C was  $0.49 \pm 0.33$ . There is a potential that a portion of this increase was the result of increased irrigation in the compost- amended soils (Wu et al., 2008). Increased irrigation results in greater plant growth in comparison to non- irrigated soils in arid regions.


## ***Soil microbial activity***

Compost application also increased microbial activity ( $p < 0.009$ ) in comparison to the control soils. Microbial activity was 2.23 times greater in the compost- amended soils in comparison to the control soil (Figure 2). The organic matter in compost provides food for microorganisms. All of the work rows that we sampled had a grass cover crop or organic mulch that would also have provided a substrate for microbial growth.

## ***Water holding and bulk density***

Increased water holding capacity ( $p < 0.01$ ) as well as decreased bulk density ( $p < 0.004$ ) were also observed in the compost- amended soils (Figure 2). Water holding capacity was 1.57 x that of the control soils and bulk density was 0.82 times the control soils. Results and standard errors for each variable are shown below (Figure 2). It should be noted that site was also significant for each of these variables as was the site x treatment interaction. This means that the response to compost addition varied by site. Because of the wide range of sites, soil series and application rates included in this sampling, this interaction would be expected.

# -- Interim Report --



**Figure 2. The % change of soil organic carbon, microbial activity, water holding capacity and bulk density in compost amended soils in comparison to control soils (control soils taken from work row or other crop area with the same soil series).**

## **Results--Effect of Rate**

The effect of rate on each of these variables was also examined. Here the results are less clear, however there is a tendency towards more pronounced differences with higher application rates of compost. In addition to application rate, factors such as soil texture will influence soil water holding capacity and bulk density. It is likely that in a controlled study with multiple application rates over time at a single site, the effect of rate would be more pronounced and it would be possible to distinguish differences between rates in a more predictable manner.

### ***Carbon related variables***

Soil carbon showed a tendency to increase in comparison to the control soils with a slight but not statistically similar increase in the soil that had received a cumulative loading of 25 dry t/a (Figure 3). This trend was more pronounced for the two locations where a total of 45 t/a of compost had been applied. It should be noted that at one of these sites, compost applications at a low annual rate of addition had been ongoing for over 15 years. A single site with a short (2 year) history of compost use and total application of 46 t/a showed very little increase in soil carbon. This site showed no change as a result of compost application for the majority of indices

# -- Interim Report --

tested. The sites that had the highest rates of compost application showed the most significant increases in soil carbon.




Figure 3. Total organic carbon in the 0-15 cm soil horizon as a function of total compost applied. Rates with the same letter are statistically similar ( $p < 0.05$ ).

It should be noted that increases in soil carbon were visible on all sites where compost had been surface applied. While soil analysis showed more pronounced increases in total soil carbon for sites that had received higher loading rates, this may be due in part to how we collected soil samples. Surface soil samples were taken from the top 15 cm of the soil. Increases in total carbon in the upper portion of the soil may have been diluted by mixing the entire top 15 cm of the soil core. The increased concentration of carbon in the soil surface was apparent at all of the orchard sites that we sampled. Measuring soil in 15 cm increments is standard practice. In hindsight, it may have been more appropriate to divide this into two depths.

Organic matter accumulation on the soil surface of an orchard sites that had received low annual compost applications (3 tons per acre) for 15 years is shown below. The color change at the soil surface indicates organic matter accumulation.



# -- Interim Report --





Figure 4. Soil bulk density in compost amended soils (ratio of observed values in amended soils in comparison to the control soils). Values <1 indicate reduced bulk density in comparison to the control soils.

# -- Interim Report --

Soil bulk density followed a predictable pattern with decreased bulk density at increasing rates of compost application (Figure 4). Soil bulk density is a measure of weight per unit area, normally expressed as  $\text{g cm}^3$ . Low bulk density indicates increased pore space and is indicative of improved soil tilth. Tilth refers to the friability of the soil that is a function of both soil texture and aggregation. Improved tilth increases root penetrability, water infiltration and soil aeration. Organic amendments improve soil bulk density by aggregating soil mineral particles. In addition, the organic fraction is much lighter in weight than the mineral fraction in soils. Increases in the organic fraction decrease the total weight and bulk density of the soil.



**Figure 5. Soil respiration ( $\text{CO}_2$  evolved) used as an indicator of soil microbial activity. The ratio of  $\text{CO}_2$  in the compost-amended soils to that evolved in the control soil can be used as a measure of increase or decrease in microbial activity in relation to compost amendment.**


Soil respiration significantly increased ( $p < 0.05$ ) in the soils that received total cumulative compost applications of 75 t/a or more (Figure 5). There was a slight but insignificant decrease in microbial respiration in both the soil that received 25 t/a and the soil that received 46 t/a of compost. It would be expected that compost application would increase soil microbial activity as the organic matter in compost provides a food source for soil microorganisms. However, one measure that our sampling wasn't able to factor in was the time between soil sampling and the

# -- Interim Report --

last compost application. It is possible that microbial activity increases immediately after compost amendment as well as during certain parts of the growing season. For some of the sites that we sampled, harvest was complete, while for others crops were still ripening. These factors may influence this measure. However, for the highest rates of compost application, microbial activity increased in comparison to the control soils.

## *Soil water*

Potential changes in soil water after compost amendment was measured using two indices; water holding capacity and infiltration rate. The most pronounced increases in soil water holding capacity were in the sites that received 75 and 200 t/a cumulative application, these were also the soils with the coarsest texture (Figure 6). The soil texture for both of these soils was loamy sand whereas the texture for the site that had received 100 t/a was silty loam. The sites with lower application rates ranged in texture from sandy loam to silty loam. Coarser textured soils have lower water holding capacity than finer textured soils and so are more likely to see improvements as a result of compost addition (Brady and Weil, 2002).



**Figure 6. Water holding capacity in compost amended soils in comparison to the control soils. Quantity of soil water at 1 barr pressure was used to determine the water holding capacity. The ratio of water in comparison to the control soil is shown.**

A stepwise regression was carried out to determine the primary factors that affected water - holding capacity for this study. This type of regression adds and removes variables from the analysis based on their ability to explain significant quantities of the variation in the data. For this analysis the probability was set for 0.05. The regression was carried out twice, once using the actual values for water content at a particular volume of soil and the second time using the ratio variable for water. The variables entered into the model for the initial run included soil texture, bulk density, total compost applied, and organic carbon content. For the second run of


# -- Interim Report --

1 the model the variables included soil texture, the ratio variables for carbon and bulk density, and  
2 total compost applied. The ratio variable for water holding capacity was used as the dependent  
3 variable.

4  
5 For the first run, the significant factors in determining water -holding capacity were soil texture  
6 (0.36), bulk density (0.556) and organic carbon (0.59). The values in the parenthesis represent  
7 the cumulative adjusted  $R^2$  value of the model. For the second run of the model using the ratio  
8 variables in an attempt to normalize the data across sites, the significant factors were total  
9 compost applied (0.26) and bulk density (0.34) with a model  $R^2$  of 0.34. These results indicate  
10 that while overall, texture is the primary factor affecting water holding capacity, increasing  
11 organic carbon is a significant factor for improving soil water holding capacity. Using the ratio  
12 variables to eliminate the influence of variation as a result of soil texture, compost loading rate  
13 was the most significant factor effecting water holding capacity.

14  
15 Water infiltration rate was also measured. Across all soils, compost addition increased water  
16 infiltration rate compared to the control soil (Figure 7). Increased infiltration is another  
17 indication of increased efficiency in water use. More rapid infiltration is associated with reduced  
18 runoff, better aeration, and improved irrigation efficiency. As with water holding capacity, soil  
19 texture will have a significant effect on infiltration rate. However, unlike water holding capacity,  
20 the largest improvements would be expected in fine textured soils that tend to be poorly drained.  
21 Because of this, soil texture is a significant factor in infiltration rate. In this study, the largest  
22 improvements in water holding capacity were seen in the coarse textured or sandy soils. The  
23 largest improvements in water infiltration rate were observed in the finer textured soils. For  
24 example, at the site in Monterey County, infiltration rate in the control averaged 17.5 minutes.  
25 In the compost- amended soils, this time was reduced to < 1 minute. Texture in this soil was a  
26 silty loam. However, in the coarser textured soils there were no significant differences in  
27 infiltration rates as a result of compost amendment for the sandy soils. At the Bruce Rucker site  
28 the soil texture was loamy sand. The infiltration rate in the control soil was  $3.3 \pm 0.3$  minutes.  
29 This increased to  $4.1 \pm 0.9$  minutes in the compost amended soils.

# -- Interim Report --



**Figure 7. Water infiltration (minutes) for all compost amended and control soils with the same soil series. Different letters above each mean indicate that the values are significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ).**

## Specific Sites

Two of the sites that we sampled can be used to illustrate the benefits of compost for different types of high value agriculture. Bruce Rucker's farm in Riverside County is representative of the benefits associated with use of high rates of compost over an extended period in organic orchard crops. The combination of high rates of compost use and a large number of data points make this a good site to use. The crops that we sampled were citrus and grapes. However, the compost application here is representative of a wide range of perennial crops that are important in California. Compost application to orchard crops is managed as annual surface application under the trees or vines. The same type of application at similar application rates was seen on this sampling trip for almonds, citrus, grapes, apricots, and mangos. The two highest revenues crops in neighboring Kern County are almonds and grapes, with close to \$1 billion in revenue annually. Grapes require approximately 5 acre ft of water per year to grow, so any increases in soil water availability would have a significant impact. It is also likely that the benefits that were observed with surface application to orchards would be similar to those observed in landscaping where compost is surface applied to ornamentals annually or at high one time rates of application (Cogger et al., 2008).

# -- Interim Report --



**Compost application rates and methods are similar for a wide range of orchard crops including (a) grapes, (b) mangos, and (c) almonds.**

The T&A site in Monterey County provides an example of the benefits of compost use in high value annual crops and results from this site will be applicable to a wide range of high value annuals where annual tillage is standard. As the only tilled site included in our sampling, it provides the only point of reference for this type of end use. The soils that we sampled had been cropped to lettuce and cauliflower. Row crops would follow similar management practices. An extension agent from Kern County noted that carrots, a row crop, were potentially the largest compost users in that county. A more detailed description of the results will be presented for these sites. We also sampled two sites where mulch (coarsely ground and minimally processed yard debris) was surface applied. Mulch application offers an alternative end use for organics diverted from landfills. Results from these sites can be used to evaluate the benefits of direct mulch application.

## ***Orchard crops***

The orchard that we sampled was located in Riverside County. It has been managed as an organic orchard for an extended period with compost applications 2 times per year, banded of 10 dry tons per acre. Total application at this site was approximately 200 dry tons per acre. This is the cumulative application following 10 years of compost addition. The benefits observed from compost use at this site were the greatest of any of the sites sampled. It was also the highest cumulative loading of compost. At the other site that was sampled in Riverside County, we were not able to get a precise cumulative loading rate for compost. However, the best guess of the farmer was somewhere over 75 dry t/a. The benefits observed on this site were very similar to that seen in the 200 t/a site with a greater increases in water holding capacity and microbial activity and lower increases in soil carbon content (see above tables to compare 75 and 200 t/a

# -- Interim Report --

responses). This suggests that a high level of response is possible once a certain loading rate is reached (Albiach et al., 2001; Aggelides and Londra, 2001; Annabi et al., 2007; Bresson et al., 2001; Kong et al., 2005; ROU, 2006; Tian et al., 2009).

## ***Row crops***

The truck farm that we sampled was located in Monterey County. We sampled two compost amended fields and one control field, all within the same soil series and in close proximity to each other. All fields had recently been harvested and so were in similar conditions. The owner of the compost treated sites leased his ground and required compost use as a condition of the lease. We did not get any additional information on management practices of the tenant farmer. One of the fields was managed as an organic site and had received total compost application of approximately 45 dry t/a. The other site was managed conventionally and had a lower annual compost application rate with total cumulative applications of 25 t/a. For both of these fields compost was applied to the entire field and tilled into the surface soil. The soils produced 2-3 crops per year and were tilled several times each year. This was the only site that we sampled with this type of usage where compost application rates were known and the control soil was the same soil series. Extensive use of irrigation water in Monterey has resulted in saltwater intrusion into the ground water table. As a way to minimize dependence on groundwater, reclaimed water from wastewater treatment plants is now used extensively in Monterey to irrigate truck crops. Any increases in soil water holding capacity would further reduce dependence on groundwater.



The three sampling sites in Monterey, (a) freshly tilled organic compost (b) newly harvested compost and (c) harvested control

## ***Mulch application***



# -- Interim Report --

We sampled two sites where mulch had been applied. These were both in Ventura County. We also visited a site where mulch was being applied. According to the mulch purveyor, the primary reason for mulch application at all sites was to limit runoff. Direct application of mulch is potentially more economical than compost application as there is minimal processing involved. It has the potential to offer an alternative to compost. However, direct application of mulch provides a highly reactive, potentially nitrogen and nutrient limiting material to soils. There is also a potential for contaminants in the mulch that would have been screened out as part of the compost finishing process. Weed seeds are also a potential concern with direct mulch application. There is also the potential for a high carbon mulch to limit nitrogen availability. The decomposition and high temperatures required for composting kill all noxious weed seeds and provide a stable product that has a uniform nutrient content.



Mulch in (a) an application vehicle, (b) freshly applied to a citrus grove and (c) an intact soil core from a field where mulch had been applied the previous year.



# -- Interim Report --

**Table 4. Response to compost or mulch application for three specific sites. Means  $\pm$  standard error are shown.**

<b>Organic Orchard (200 t/a cumulative)</b>							
	<b>Total N</b>	<b>Available P</b>	<b>Organic Carbon</b>	<b>Bulk Density</b>	<b>Microbial activity</b>	<b>H<sub>2</sub>O per 100g</b>	<b>Infiltration rate</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>mg kg</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>g cm<sup>3</sup></b>		<b>mls</b>	<b>minutes</b>
Control	0.04 $\pm$ 0.007	115 $\pm$ 15	0.37 $\pm$ 0.1	1.5 $\pm$ 0.2	31.5 $\pm$ 5	9.6 $\pm$ 0.6	3.3 $\pm$ 0.3
Compost	0.28 $\pm$ 0.04	624 $\pm$ 59	2.7 $\pm$ 0.4	1.1 $\pm$ 0.1	64 $\pm$ 14	21.3 $\pm$ 3.7	4.1 $\pm$ 0.9
% change	700%	543%	730%	-27%	206%	225%	24% longer
\							
<b>High value row crops (25 and 45 t/a cumulative)</b>							
	<b>Total N</b>	<b>Available P</b>	<b>Organic Carbon</b>	<b>Bulk Density</b>	<b>Microbial activity</b>	<b>H<sub>2</sub>O per 100g</b>	<b>Infiltration rate</b>
Control	0.08	333 $\pm$ 6	0.7 $\pm$ 0.02	1.7 $\pm$ 0.1	19 $\pm$ 4.4	25 $\pm$ 0.08	18 $\pm$ 17
Compost							
low	0.1 $\pm$ 0.003		0.9 $\pm$ 0.03	1.5 $\pm$ 0.1	17 $\pm$ 4	25.6 $\pm$ 0.6	
high	0.1 $\pm$ 0.002	394 $\pm$ 85	1.1 $\pm$ 0.05	1.3 $\pm$ 0.08	27.8 $\pm$ 5	29 $\pm$ 0.6	0.67 $\pm$ 0.1
% change	125%	118%	157%	-24%	146%	116%	4% as long
<b>Mulch (120 t/a single application)</b>							
	<b>Total N</b>	<b>Available P</b>	<b>Organic Carbon</b>	<b>Bulk Density</b>	<b>Microbial activity</b>	<b>H<sub>2</sub>O per 100g</b>	<b>Infiltration rate</b>
Control	0.2 $\pm$ 0.07	257 $\pm$ 67	2.3 $\pm$ 0.9	1.3 $\pm$ 0.1	33 $\pm$ 5	32 $\pm$ 2.5	24 $\pm$ 2.9
Mulch	0.2 $\pm$ 0.04	225 $\pm$ 57	2.1 $\pm$ 0.6	1.1 $\pm$ 0.4	54 $\pm$ 8	38 $\pm$ 1	0.9 $\pm$ 0.6
% change	no change	-13%	-9%	-15%	164%	119%	4% as long

# -- Interim Report --

The values for each of the measured variables (both quantitative values and % change) for the three specific sites are shown in Table 4. These values will be used to compare the expected benefits for compost use reported in the ROU study with the values collected in our sampling trip.

## **Comparison with Recycled Organics Unit LCA**

The Recycled Organics Unit (2006) modeled benefits associated with the use of compost in grapes based on a surface application of 75 dry metric tons once every three years. The primary purpose of this application was to provide a surface mulch for the vines. Benefits were also modeled for application as a soil conditioner at an annual application rate of 12 Mg ha (5 tons per acre) to cotton, a high value row crop. Two types of compost were used in this study, a low N compost with negligible fertilizer value was used for mulch and a higher N compost was used as a soil amendment. General benefits as well as benefits for GHGs were observed. These included: reduced water consumption, avoided use of synthetic fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides, carbon sequestration, soil structure improvement (% decrease in bulk density), increased plant productivity and reduced erosion. This study noted increasing benefits with increased application, although it was noted that this increase was not linear and that at a certain point, a maximum level of benefits would be reached. Transport distance to the application site had a minimal effect on total net benefits. For mulch application, benefits ranged from 400 Mg CO<sub>2eq</sub> for application of 83 Mg ha to 600 Mg CO<sub>2eq</sub> for application of 125 Mg ha. Benefits for soil conditioner were significantly lower with benefits of 100 Mg CO<sub>2eq</sub> for application of 25 Mg ha and benefits of 200 Mg CO<sub>2eq</sub> for applications of 50 Mg ha. We have compared the values from our sampling to those used in the ROU study (Table 4). Specific information for each category is given below. In general, the magnitude of the benefit per Mg of compost applied from our sampling was similar in magnitude to the reported benefits in the ROU study (Table 4). Our values, while comparable, were consistently higher than the reported values in the ROU study.

### ***Water use***

The study quantified benefits associated with compost use for increased water use efficiency. Data from previous studies was plotted as % increase in soil moisture per Mg compost applied. This increase was then multiplied by the water use for the crop to determine the decrease in water use as a result of compost application. The % increase in water use efficiency and associated decrease in water demand was taken to be 0.125% per metric ton of compost applied (Table 4). Based on the results from our sampling, % increase in water use efficiency ranged from 0.44% per metric ton mulch applied, 0.5% for use of compost applied as a surface mulch in orchards, and 1.1% for incorporation into row crops. It should be noted that increases in water use are likely not linear across application rates and will also vary by soil series. As the stepwise regression analysis showed earlier, soil texture, bulk density and organic carbon were the factors that explained the most variation in water holding capacity on all soils when quantitative data were used in the analysis (adjusted R<sup>2</sup> of 0.58). When the ratio variables were used to normalize the data, total compost application and bulk density (adjusted R<sup>2</sup> 0.34). On a more basic level, what the data collected from this study suggests is that the % improvement used for mulch application in the ROU study can be used as a very conservative value for all types of compost

# -- Interim Report --

use in California. For grapes that require 5 acre feet of water, this would mean a per acre decrease in water use of approximately 1" for each 4 US tons of compost applied.

## ***Fertilizer value***

In contrast to the ROU model, all of the organic growers that we questioned use compost as their sole source of nitrogen fertilizer. Orchard growers in Kern County use an annual application rate of 4 US tons per acre primarily to meet the fertilizer needs of the crop. This was similar to the responses that we saw with annual or bi-annual applications ranging from 4-20 t/a/yr. Here the fertilizer value of the compost was taken into account. We heard concerns from compost producers that growers were demanding higher N content in the composts. This was difficult to provide with lower N feedstocks such as yard debris. Manures, biosolids and food scraps are potential sources of high N feedstocks for the compost producers. In the ROU study, a fraction of total N and P in the compost is taken to be plant available during the first growing season with additional N and P becoming soluble during subsequent growing seasons. The CO<sub>2</sub> required to produce N, P and K is given as 3.96, 1.76 and 1.36 kg per kg, respectively (Table 4). Their report considered that for each metric ton (1000 kg) of compost applied, a total of 2.5- 5 kg N, 0.6-5 kg P and 0.6-2 kg K would be plant available over time. There was no discussion of micro-nutrient content of the composts. One of the compost - manufacturers that we worked with provides a product sheet to customers that lists plant available nutrients as 18 lbs N, 19 lbs P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and 20 lbs K per ton applied. The nutrient value of this compost in comparison to the value of the other composts used in this study is shown in Table 1. This is equivalent to 9, 9.5 and 10 kg per dry Mg or 35.6 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per 9 kg N, 7.2 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per 9.5 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and 13.6 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per kg K. The GHG avoidance based on the total NPK value of one Mg of this particular compost would be equivalent to 56 kg CO<sub>2</sub>. This was a relatively low nutrient value compost. It was used by one organic orchard as the sole source of fertilizer and was supplemented with chicken manure compost at another orchard. For the specific sites, we saw increases in plant available P of 443% times in the orchard in comparison to the work row, 18% in the row crop in comparison to a conventionally fertilized field and to a decrease of 13% in the mulch. Increases in total N ranged from 700% in the orchard, 25% for row crops and no change for mulch. In the orchard site, the control was the work-row that was planted in a grass but had likely received no additional fertilizer applications. In the row crop, the control was another farmed field that had likely received fertilizer application. Compost addition increased the residual fertility in the soil post harvest in comparison to synthetic fertilizers. In addition, increases in micro nutrients were seen in the compost amended soils in comparison to control soils with available micronutrients similar in the compost amended soils to treated fields. Micro- nutrients will also require energy to manufacture although values for these were not included in the ROU study or the published literature.

We would recommend using a per dry ton credit of 78 lbs CO<sub>2</sub> for N, 16 lbs for P (taking the fraction of P in P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> into account) and 30 lbs for K or a total fertilizer credit of 124 lbs CO<sub>2</sub> per dry ton compost applied. If specific product information is available, that can be substituted for this default. There was no increase in soil fertility for the mulch- amended soils tested in this study.

# -- Interim Report --

## ***Herbicide/pesticide use***

The ROU study considers the potential for compost use to replace the needs for certain herbicides and pesticides. The GHG avoided from this is given as 30 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per kg pesticide/herbicide. In addition, other environmental concerns associated with use of herbicides may make this a valuable aspect of compost use. The high prevalence of compost in organic orchards suggests that these farmers may be realizing some of the benefits of compost re weed and pest control. Organic farmers have to rely on alternative measures as synthetic herbicides and pesticides are not allowed in organic agriculture. It was beyond the scope of the present sampling to quantify changes in herbicide and pesticide use. The ROU study estimated use of herbicide use as 2-6 L per ha for vineyards with 30 kg CO<sub>2</sub> required to manufacture and apply each kg of herbicide. Using the low end of this estimate, 2 kg, the potential CO<sub>2</sub> credits associated with compost use would be 60 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per acre. As organic farms are prohibited from using herbicides, it seems clear that compost would be an acceptable alternative.

## ***Total organic carbon***

The ROU uses a value of 70 kg C per metric ton of compost as a default value for carbon sequestration in soils as a result of compost application (Table 4). Expressed as CO<sub>2</sub>, that is equivalent to 257 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per metric ton compost. For this study, if a surface 0-15 cm or 0-6" soil weight of 2000 metric tons per ha or 1000 tons per acre is used as an approximation, then each 1% increase in soil carbon has an associated CO<sub>2</sub> increase of 20 metric tons C per hectare or 73 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per ha (Brady and Weil, 2002). At the orchard site, soil carbon increased from 0.37 to 2.7% after application of 200 t/a compost. This is an increase in soil carbon equivalent to 23.3 tons per acre based on the weight of an acre furrow slice (top 6" of soil equal to 1000 tons). On the basis of each ton of compost applied, this increases equals 0.427 tons of soil C. In metric units, this increase is equivalent to 381 kg per metric ton of dry compost. For the row crop site, the increase in soil carbon equals 291 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per metric ton of compost applied. The value for the orchard site was significantly higher than the value used by the ROU while the value for the row crop site was similar. Frequent tilling will increase aeration in the soil and result in faster mineralization of organic carbon. The orchard application is representative of a no till management practice. No till farming has been widely recognized as a means to increase soil carbon. There is an existing protocol on the Chicago Climate Exchange that gives carbon credits for farms that convert from conventional tillage to no till practices (<http://www.chicagoclimatex.com/content.jsf?id=781>). The results from this study highlight the potential for compost amendments to increase the carbon reserves in soils. Higher carbon sequestration rates are also suggested for no till sites. The values for carbon sequestration used by the ROU appear to be conservative for no till sites and appropriate for sites where frequent tilling is standard. For no till sites, a more appropriate value would be 300-325 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per dry metric ton compost applied.

## ***Remediation of saline/sodic soils***

The ROU includes the potential for compost to ameliorate soil sodicity as part of the benefits associated with compost use (Table 4). For almost all of the farms that we sampled, gypsum was routinely mixed with compost prior to application as means to reduce soil salinity and sodicity. Some of the farmers we spoke to said that salinity was a concern and one of the reasons for their use of compost. Although we measured pH and electrical conductivity (EC), gypsum addition

# -- Interim Report --

made it impossible to distinguish any potential effects of compost on soil salinity. Because of the widespread use of gypsum, our sampling suggests that would be difficult to isolate the benefits of compost in relation to soil salinity. The potential benefits associated with compost use would include replacement and conservation of gypsum as well as an increase in productivity of the affected soils. There is also a potential for the acreage available for growing salt sensitive crops to increase. For example, grapes and almonds see yield declines with soil  $EC > 2 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$ . In Kern County, 2006 revenues from these crops was in excess of \$950 million. Salinity is a major concern in Kern County. University of California extension bulletins for Kern County suggest planting of salt tolerant crops, appropriate soil sampling, and chemical means to ameliorate these soils (Sanden et al.). This suggests that research trials in high salt soils with different combinations of gypsum and compost would be an effective means to determine if compost can substitute for gypsum at these sites. This would then provide an alternative to chemical remediation methods for high salt soils.

## ***Erosion***

Soil erosion is a major concern. Soil erosion occurs as a result of rain, flooding or wind events that transport soil particles. Eroded soils are often deposited in streams and can result in water quality degradation through increased eutrophication, increased turbidity, and decreased water depth which can lead to elevated temperatures. High intensity rain events carry a greater potential for soil erosion. In addition to soil erosion, low water infiltration rates increase the potential for water erosion via overland flow. This reduces water storage in soils. It also increases the potential for nutrient movement to streams via dissolution of nutrients from the soil surface into the water eroding from the soil surface. The ROU used existing literature to develop a graph of compost application (x axis) versus soil loss (y axis). From this graph, they calculate that use of compost as a soil conditioner, incorporated into the soil at  $12 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$  would reduce soil erosion by 14.8%. Based on the literature, they suggest that application of compost as a mulch in vineyards at a 10 cm depth would completely eliminate soil loss (Table 4). We did not measure soil erosive potential as part of this survey. Water infiltration rate can give some indication of erosive potential. If water enters the soil more rapidly, it is less likely to erode off of the soil surface. For this sampling we saw a decrease of average infiltration rate across all sites that had received compost with infiltration requiring 33% as much time as control sites. This suggests that the estimates for reduced erosion used by the ROU would be sufficiently conservative for California sites. It should be noted that these benefits would be most pronounced in areas prone to erosion, such as areas with slope as well as areas where high intensity rainfall can occur (Susan Bolton, University of Washington). These benefits are not limited to agricultural sites. Reduced soil loss has been observed in compost- amended sites following forest fires (Meyer et al., 2001). Reductions in water quantity as well as improvements in water quality have also been observed when composts have been used alongside roads and in new home construction (McDonald, 2005).

## ***Soil structure***

The ROU used soil bulk density as a measure of improved soil structure. Changes in soil aggregation have also been used (Annabi et al., 2007). In their analysis, the ROU discounts the potential for surface applied compost to alter soil bulk density, noting the time required for surface applied materials to alter the subsoil. Changes in bulk density were considered for compost tilled into soils with a predicted 2% decrease in bulk density for each 12 Mg of compost

# -- Interim Report --

that is incorporated (Table 4). In our sampling we saw pronounced decreases in bulk density in the tilled site, the long-term orchard site with surface applied compost as well as for mulch application. These ranged from a 15% decrease for the mulch, a 24% decrease for the tilled site and a 27% decrease for the orchard site. In general, decreases in bulk density were more pronounced with higher rates of compost application. However, changes were apparent at both surface applied and tilled sites. On the basis of a 12 t ha application rate, we saw a decrease in bulk density of 0.7% in both the orchard site and the mulch site and a decrease of 2.9% in the tilled site. This suggests that the value used by the ROU would be applicable for tilled sites in California and that a value of 0.5% decrease in bulk density would be appropriate for use in orchard or mulch sites.

## ***Plant response***

The ROU study included yield increases as part of their evaluation process. They note that responses vary significantly by season and soil type. Increases in yield for cotton were assumed to be 11.5% for an application of 12 t ha of compost (Table 4). Grape yields were taken to be 27% based on a 10 cm surface mulch application of compost. Most of the farmers that we spoke to said that they used compost because of the beneficial effects on fruit quality and plant health. However, yield increases were not quantified as part of this sampling exercise.

## ***Soil tilth***

Arable land area in New South Wales is 104,000 km<sup>2</sup>. The study noted that degradation of arable lands results in an annual loss in revenue of \$700 million Australian. This is equivalent to \$6,730 per ha. Reduced soil organic matter concentrations were seen as the primary factor responsible for this degradation with many soils having total organic carbon concentrations of < 1%. Concentrations ≥ 2% were sited as desirable for maintaining soil structure and plant productivity. For this study, the average organic carbon concentration in control soils collected from the same soil series as the treated soils was 0.69%. In comparison, the organic carbon concentration in the paired compost amended soils was 1.27%.

In addition to using total soil carbon as an indicator of soil tilth, another index that reflect a healthy soil is soil microbial activity. There are a range of indicators of soil microbial activity. For this sampling, CO<sub>2</sub> production was measured on soils following an incubation period at a fixed temperature and moisture. The ml CO<sub>2</sub> produced per kg dry soil measured 28.6 in the control soil and 50.2 in the compost- amended soils. While this average shows a significant increase in microbial activity as a result of compost addition, the increases in microbial activity were only significant at the higher application rates (>75 tons per acre). This may be the result of the way that the soil samples were collected. Surface soil samples were taken from the top 15 cm of the soil. For the majority of sites, the compost was surface applied. For lower rates or for sites with a shorter history of compost application, the effect of compost on microbial activity may have been diluted when the compost was mixed with the soil from the bottom portion of the 0-15 cm horizon.

# -- Interim Report --

**Table 5. A comparison of sampling results from this study with ROU Life Cycle data. The ROU study (2006) quantified potential benefits of compost use for row crops and orchard crops for soils in New South Wales using an extensive literature review of benefits associated with use of compost to develop values. The results of our sampling are compared to the results of the ROU study and default recommendations are suggested.**

	ROU	CA tilled	CA- surface	CA- mulch	Recommended Default
	per dry Mg compost (unless otherwise specified)				
Water efficiency (% increase)	0.125	1.1	0.5	0.44	0.125
Fertilizer (NPK kg CO <sub>2eq</sub> )	11.8-31.3*		66	0	66- based on NPK of 9, 9.5 and 10 kg per Mg Use specific compost analysis when possible
Herbicide	30 kg CO <sub>2eq</sub> per kg herbicide				60 kg per ha in orchard crops based on 2 herbicide sprays per season
Organic carbon	256 kg CO <sub>2</sub>	291 kg CO <sub>2</sub>	382 kg CO <sub>2</sub>	0	256 kg CO <sub>2</sub> for tilled sites, 300-325 for no till or orchard sites
Saline/sodic	Gypsum replacement				California specific studies recommended
Erosion	1.2% reduction in tilled crops, complete reduction for mulch	Infiltration rate 4% as long as control	Infiltration rate 24% longer than control- results specific to	Infiltration rate 4% as long as control	We saw an overall average decrease in water infiltration rate of 33% across all sites that received compost or mulch. This can be used as an indicator of reduced erosion potential. Use

# -- Interim Report --

	applications	this site		ROU default values	
Soil structure-bulk density (% decrease)	2% decrease per 12 Mg compost for incorporated	2.9% decrease per 12 Mg	0.7% decrease per 12 Mg	0.7% decrease per 12 Mg	2% per 12 Mg incorporated, 0.5% per 12 Mg for surface application
Plant yield	1-2% yield increase per Mg compost				1-2% yield increase per Mg compost
Soil Tilth-using carbon and microbial activity as indicators	Degradation of soils has a cost of \$4484 per ha	146% increase in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/increase in carbon from 0.7 to 1.1%	Overall 33% increase in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/overall increase in carbon from 0.7% to 1.27%	164% increase in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions/no increase in soil carbon	ROU notes soil with organic C> 2% is healthy. Use of compost over time has the potential to improve soil tilth and result in quantifiable \$ savings per ha

---

**\*The ROU study was done using standard units. The standard unit for land is a hectare. One hectare measures 100 x 100 m<sup>2</sup> and is equivalent to 2.47 acres. The standard unit for mass is one metric ton which is equivalent to 1000 kg. Compost applied at 1 US ton per acre is the same as compost applied at 2.24 metric tons per ha.**



# -- Interim Report --

## Conclusions

In our limited field sampling we saw a range of improvements in soil quality as a result of compost application. In general, the improvements that were observed were greater than those predicted by the Recycled Organic Unit (2006) in their life cycle analysis of windrow composting. A direct comparison of the results of this field survey and the ROU recommendations is shown in Table 5. . The total benefits associated with compost use include GHG savings, water savings and improvements in both soil quality and plant yield. For this study, it was only possible to measure a portion of the variables that were evaluated in the ROU literature review. However, for those variables that we were able to measure, results from this study are comparable to those reported in the ROU study. This suggests that response to compost application for the variables outside the scope of the current sampling effort may also be comparable to those reported in the ROU study. Many of these benefits have no direct GHG associated savings. In other cases, GHG savings are small in comparison to other environmental or financial benefits. Water savings (as estimated by increases in water holding capacity) were sited as one benefit of compost use in the ROU study. More pronounced benefits were observed in our sampling particularly on coarser textured soils. The energy required to irrigate a field in relation to predicted water savings could be calculated to estimate potential GHG savings. However, the more significant impact is likely to be in water savings and reduced use of water in compost amended agriculture. Similarly, yield increases are likely not a significant source of GHG credits. However, the associated economic benefits of yield increases are highly significant.

The ROU study estimated potential GHG savings for both surface applied compost and compost tilled into the soil (Table 6). For their study, the compost used as mulch is a low nutrient value material. Compost in California is not classified based on its nutrient content. For our sampling, the nutrient value of the compost was equally important in tilled and surface applications. In fact, for organic farming, composts are often the primary source of nutrients for the crop. Our sampling showed consistently significant increases in plant nutrients in compost- amended soils in comparison to soils collected from work rows/same soil series. The plant available nutrients were generally similar in compost- amended soils and conventionally managed soils. These results confirm the nutrient value of composts used in California agriculture. The ROU study gave significant GHG credits for compost use for increasing soil carbon, reducing use of pesticides/herbicides and for replacing synthetic fertilizer. The quantity of credits varied by the type of compost as well as the end use. This study was able to quantify GHG credits based on soil carbon and fertilizer value of the compost. The GHG benefits for both the ROU study and our sampling are shown in Table 6. The highest credits were associated for use as mulch where herbicide avoidance was also taken into account. The ROU study credited 316 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per dry Mg compost used in orchards where the result from our study, based on data from the Rucker farm, totaled 508 kg. It should be noted that this farm had the highest cumulative loading rate of compost of all of the farms included in our sampling. However, the % change in soil carbon in relation to quantity of compost applied was similar for the Rucker site and the two other highest cumulative loading rates sites. This indicates that benefits/GHG credits for soil carbon calculated on the basis of credit per dry Mg compost applied would be similar for these sites as well. For tilled sites, the ROU study credited 277 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per dry Mg compost used. Here, based on the results from the T&A site, our credits totaled 357 kg CO<sub>2</sub> per dry Mg compost.

# -- Interim Report --

**Table 6. Greenhouse gas savings associated with the use of compost for surface application (mulch) and tilled into soils (till). Results presented include savings calculated in the Recycled Organics LCA and from samples collected at an organic orchard and tilled row crop site in CA.**

	<b>Mulch</b>		<b>Till</b>	
	ROU	CA	ROU	CA
	kg CO <sub>2</sub> per dry Mg Compost			
Fertilizer		66	21	66
Herbicide	60	60		
Soil Carbon	256	382	256	291
<b>Total GHG benefits</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>357</b>

Due to the variety of soils, topography, rainfall frequency and intensity, and types of compost use, response per dry ton of compost applied will vary across the state. However, our study showed consistently better responses with increased compost applications over time. The results from both our sampling and the ROU study suggest that consistent use of compost over time will improve soil health and plant yield. This suggests that compost use can result in increased profits in the agricultural sector from higher yield as well as improved soil structure. Overall benefits from use of compost can have a significant impact on GHG balances, water use efficiency, soil sustainability, and income from agriculture. Impacts for certain categories will need to be accompanied by appropriate educational materials so that farmers or homeowners will understand the potential changes in water and fertilizer needs for a crop and adjust their inputs accordingly. Water savings are also most likely to be observed in coarser textured, well- drained soils. In addition to agricultural use, which was the focus of our survey, similar benefits would be expected for compost use in landscaping, restoration, urban areas, and on greenscapes adjoining roads.

# -- Interim Report --

## **Acknowledgments**

We were able to complete this sampling largely due to the assistance in finding and gaining access to sites of the following individuals. In addition to identifying sites, they were able to provide important information on farming practices, site history and in certain cases, they also assisted in the sampling itself.

John Beerman, California Bio-Mass  
Richard Crockett, Burrtech Waste Industries  
Ken Holladay, Organic Ag. Inc.  
Bill Camarillo, Agromin  
Gus Gunderson, Limoneira Company  
Dave Baldwin, Community Recycling and Resource Recovery  
Jack Pandol, The Grapery  
Eric Espinosa, Kochergan Farms  
Kevin Buchnoff, Kochergan Farms  
Stan Mitchell, Pacific Coast Ag.  
Greg Ryan, Z-Best Composting  
Don Wolf, Grover Environmental  
Peter Reece, Ratto Brothers  
Kim Carrier, Jepson Prairie Organics  
Bob Shaffer, Ag. Consultant.

# -- Interim Report --

## References

- Aggelides, S.M., and P.A. Londra. 2001. Effects of compost produced from town wastes and sewage sludge on the physical properties of a loamy and a clay soil. *Bioresource Techno.* 71:253-259
- Albaladejo, J., J. Lobe, C. Boix-Fayos, G.G. Barbera, and M. Martinez-Mena. 2008. Long-term effect of a single application of organic refuse on carbon sequestration and soil physical properties. *J. Environ. Qual.* 37:2093-2099.
- Albiach, R., R. Canet, F. Pomares, and F. Ingelmo. 2001. Organic matter components and aggregate stability after the application of different amendments to a horticultural soils. *Bioresource Tech.* 76:125-129.
- Annabi, M.S. Huot, C. Francou, M. Poitrenaud, and Y. LeBissonnais. 2007. Soil aggregate stability improvement with urban composts of different maturities. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 71:413-423.
- Brady, N. and R.W. Weil. 2002. *The Nature and Properties of Soils*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Bresson, L.M., C. Koch, Y. LeBissonnais, E. Barriuso, and V. Lecomte. 2001. Soil surface structure stabilization by municipal waste compost application. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 65:1804-1811.
- Brown, S. L., W. Berti, R.L. Chaney J Halfrisch and J Ryan. 2004. In situ use of soil amendments to reduce the bioaccessibility and phytoavailability of soil lead. *J. Environ Qual.* 33:522-531,
- Chicago Climate Exchange. 2009. CCX offsets report Vol1 no 1  
[www.chicagoclimatex.com/docs/offsets/Reports/CCX\\_Offsets\\_Report\\_V1No1\\_Jan09.pdf](http://www.chicagoclimatex.com/docs/offsets/Reports/CCX_Offsets_Report_V1No1_Jan09.pdf)
- CIWMB, Waste Characterization 2004
- Clean Development Mechanism. 2008. Tool to determine methane emissions avoided from disposal of waste at a solid waste disposal site, version 04, EB 41. UNFCCC/CCNUCC:  
<http://cdm.unfccc.int/methodologies/PAmethodologies/approved.html>
- Cogger, C., R. Hummel, J. Hart, and A. Bary. 2008. Soil and Redosier Dogwood response to incorporated and surface- applied compost. *Hort Sci* 43:2143-2150.
- Deurer, M., S. Sivakurmaran, S. Ralle, I. Vogeler, I. McIvor, B. Clothier, S. Green, and J. Bachmann. 2008. A new method to quantify the impact of soil carbon management on biophysical soil properties: the example of two apple orchard systems in New Zealand. *J. Environ. Qual.* 37:915-924.

# -- Interim Report --

Favoino, E. and D. Hogg. 2008. The potential role of compost in reducing greenhouse gases. *Waste Manag & Research* 26:61-69.

Grossman, R.B. and T.G. Reinsch. 2002. Bulk density and linear extensibility, p. 201-228. In Dane, J.H., and E.G. Topp (eds.) *Methods of soil analysis. Part 4. Physical Methods*. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Book Series 5. SSSA, Madison, WI.

Kong, A.Y., J. Six, D.C. Bryant, R. Ford Denison, and C. van Kessel. 2005. The relationship between carbon input, aggregation, and soil organic carbon stabilization in sustainable cropping systems. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 69:1078-1085.

Lal, R. 2007. Soil science and the carbon civilization. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 71:1425-1437.

Mann, C. 2008 Our good earth, the future rests on the soil beneath our feet, can we save it? *National Geographic* September: 80-106.

McDonald, D. 2005. Soil restoration with organics enters mainstream of storm water practices. *Biocycle* 46:4:20-23.

Mehlich, A. 1984. Mehlich 3 soil test extractant: a modification of the Mehlich 2 extractant. *Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal.* 15:1409-1416.

Meyer, V.F., E.F. Redente, K.A. Barbarick, and R. Brobst. 2001. Biosolids applications affect runoff water quality following forest fire. *J. Environ. Qual.* 30:1528-1532.

Pipatti, R., J. Wagner, S. Alves, Q. Gao, C. LCabrera, K. Mareckova, H. Oonk, E. Scheehle, C. Sharma, A. Smith, and M. Yamada. 2006 Chapter 3 Solid Waste Disposal

Recycled Organics Unit. 2006. Life cycle inventory and life cycle assessment for windrow composting systems. The Univ. of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. Available at <http://www.recycledorganics.com/publications/reports/lca/lca.htm> (verified 5 Mar. 2008).

Sanden, B., A. Fulton, and L. Ferguson. Managing salinity soil and water amendments University of California Cooperative Extension, Kern County [http://cekern.ucdavis.edu/Irrigation\\_Management/MANAGING\\_SALINITY,\\_SOIL\\_AND\\_WATER\\_AMENDMENTS.htm](http://cekern.ucdavis.edu/Irrigation_Management/MANAGING_SALINITY,_SOIL_AND_WATER_AMENDMENTS.htm)

Schroder, J.L., H. Zhang, d. Zhou, N. Basta, W.R. Raun, M.E. Payton, and A. Zazulak. 2008. The effect of long-term annual application of biosolids on soil properties, phosphorus and metals. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 72:73-82.

Smith, P., D. Martino, Z.Cai, D. Gwary, H. Janzen, P. Kumar, B. McCarl, S. Ogle, F. O'Mara, C. Rice, B. Scholes, and O. Sirotenko. 2007. Agriculture. In *Climate change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental*

# -- Interim Report --

Panel on Climate Change. [B. Metz, O.R. Davidson, P.R. Bosch, R. Dave, L.A. Meyer (eds.)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK

Soil Quality Institute. 1999. Soil Quality Test Kit Guide. U. S Department of Agriculture. [http://soils.usda.gov/sqi/assessment/files/test\\_kit\\_complete.pdf](http://soils.usda.gov/sqi/assessment/files/test_kit_complete.pdf).

SPSS. 2005. SPSS for MacIntosh version 16.0. SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL

Tian, G., T.C. Granato, A.E. Cox, R.I. Pietz, C. R. Carlson, Jr. and Z. Abedin. 2009. Soil carbon sequestration resulting from long-term application of biosolids for land reclamation. J. Environ. Qual. 38:61-74.

USEPA. 2006. Solid waste management and greenhouse gases: A life-cycle assessment of emissions and sinks, 3rd. ed.  
<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/wycd/waste/SWMGHGreport.html>

USEPA. 2007(a). Inventory of greenhouse gas emissions and sinks, 1990 – 2005.

USEPA. 2007(b). Emission factor documentation for AP-42 section 2.4 municipal solid waste landfills, revised. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards.

Wu, L., Y. Wood, P. Jiang, L. Li, G. Pan, J. Lu, A. Chang, and H. A. Enloe. 2008. Carbon sequestration and dynamics of two irrigated agricultural soils in California. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 72:808-814.